

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary		Application No. 10/576,581	Applicant(s) BAN ET AL.
Examiner David K. O'Dell		Art Unit 1625	

All Participants:

(1) David K. O'Dell.

(2) Mark Nuell.

Date of Interview: 30 April 2009

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed: _____

Claims discussed: _____

Prior art documents discussed: _____

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Status of Application: pending

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 4:00 P.M.

/David K. O'Dell/
Examiner, Art Unit 1625

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner had apparently misinterpreted the variables Y' and Z. The examiner had intended to restrict upon Y' instead of Z and p as was set forth previously. Rather than issue a new restriction requirement the examiner called Mr. Nuell to explain the discrepancy, clarify the requirement and have the election take place over the phone to advance prosecution. After calling again on May 7, 2009 the applicant agreed to a new restriction which is set forth in the attached action.